The American Freedom Association BULLETIN

PUBLISHED AS THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN FREEDOM ASSOCIATION, INC.

Vol. III, No. 1 | 141 East Corriher Avenue, Salisbury, N. C. | December-January, 1955

Letter To The President

Over a year ago, Comdr. G. W. Greene, Catawba College Professor of Political Social Science, Veteran of World Wars I and II, including nearly three years in a Japanese Prison Camp, and Vice-Chairman of the AFA Board of Directors, wrote a letter to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Today, as we begin a new year midst "whistling in the dark" and glib predictions of "everything will turn out all right", while general confusion, fear and despair concerning the prospects for real peace permeate every nation on earth, it is believed that this letter is timely, and might well serve as "base of orientation" for AFA members and friends who seek a logical approach to establishing world law with justice.

The following are excerpts from Comdr. Greene's letter of October 20, 1953:

"There has come to my desk the full text of the address made by Dr. John Foster Dulles before the General Assembly of the U.N. on September 17th, 1953 and I am going to write to express my agreement with his thinking as expressed therein and to promise my support. I also have some suggestions.

"In his address Dr. Dulles, after outlining the simple things that men everywhere want, said: 'Surely it is not beyond the wit of man to make it impossible to satisfy such wants and to put to route the vast impersonal forces which seem imperiously to demand that humanity be bent and broken merely to produce the engines for its own destruction.' My impression is that he feels, as I believe you do also, that this can best be accomplished through the revision of the United Nations Charter under Article 109. This I believe and I am working for it with all my energies.

"Now to my suggestions, three in number:

"First of all, I suggest that the United States take the lead in calling for the revision conference letting our purpose in so doing be made unmistakably clear showing that we seek the betterment of all mankind. Personally, I am an American first just as in my local community I am a Greene family man first. It must be clear, however, that for my own good and for the good of all I too must value the rights, hopes and aspirations of the other families in my home community and that the same is true in the world community with respect to the rights, hopes and aspirations of other national groups.'

"Secondly, I suggest that our carefully laid plans need to be for revision that will provide for a step by step succession of agreements which are 'executed' in nature instead of being 'executary' only. Such steps present attainable goals and as each step is implemented the next one seems to be 'logical' to constituencies and is thereby more easily attainable. At the same time rigidly predetermined procedures can and frequently do cause one to overlook the end sought in the effort to put over details where no vital principle is involved. One is apt to fall into the error pointed up in the Cantonese colloquial saying, which I translate loosely as: 'Other men's wives and his own literary efforts look good to one'.

"Thirdly, I suggest that as far as possible the steps to be taken be arrived at by the discussion method and that they should be aimed at the desires of all peoples as shown in their own 'frame of reference', or their own 'mores', or their own 'living law' depending on whether one wants to use the language of Psychology, Sociology or Political Science. Where this is done rules of behavior do not have to be enforced upon the vast majority of people and groups, and in the case of the exceptional person or group that refuses to conform the enforcement upon that segment is approved generally.

(Continued on Page 2)

Co-Existence or No-Existence?

'ROUTE TO NOWHERE'

Hesse in The St. Louis Globe-Democrat

"Co-existence" is a term being used freely by many people today. What does it mean? Unfortunately, it means different things, depending on who is using the word.

As an editorial in the Salisbury POST defined it recently:

"To the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin, co-existence clearly does not mean a state of happy comradeship with the free nations. It spells opportunity for conquest by non-military devices, for spreading its power through use of all the economic and political wiles it can apply. It is war without guns.

"In the free world, some men see co-existence as amounting to actual surrender to Communist domination, or at the very least as weak-kneed appeasement. The logic of this view is that sooner or later Communists and free men must clash in war, since to do nothing is to lose.

"At the other end of the scale, there are those who look upon co-existence as practically synonymous with a glorious peace founded on real understanding between East and West. These men seem willing to take Russian declarations of peaceful purpose at full value.

"The people who fall in the gray zones between the extremes are neither as pessimistic as the one nor as hopeful as the other.

"They believe that, short of war, there is no way Communists can be brushed off this planet. In consequence, they believe that some way of living with them must be found. When they say that they do not mean living in friendship with them, or giving in to them. They mean simply existing side by side.

"They have no illusions about Kremlin purposes. They know Russia is an armed camp, and that when it is not shooting it is practicing warfare on every other imaginable front.

"Thus they believe we free peoples must be equipped at all times to defend ourselves, and must develop political and economic programs that will keep the vulnerable but still free sectors of the globe out of Communist hands."

How long, then, will this "armed camp co-existence" continue, with its tension, nervousness and itchy-finger maneuverings?

(Continued on Page 2)